Draft Individual Review Form

Proposal number: 2001-I206-1   **Short Proposal Title: Master River Teacher Program**

1a) Are the objectives and hypotheses clearly stated?
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes – works/partnership with local organizations and teachers.

1b1) Does the conceptual model clearly explain the underlying basis for the proposed work?
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes – could have more detailed explanation of how program will also support current educational goals = standards and accountability.

1b2) Is the approach well designed and appropriate for meeting the objectives of the project?
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes – but how will the program continue after CALFED money ends?

1c1) Has the applicant justified the selection of research, pilot or demonstration project, or a full-scale implementation project?
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Not applicable.

1c2) Is the project likely to generate information that can be used to inform future decision making?
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

If this group shares with other CALFED educational grant recipients

2a) Are the monitoring and information assessment plans adequate to assess the outcome of the project?
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Not applicable.

2b) Are data collection, data management, data analysis, and reporting plans well-described, scientifically sound and adequate to meet the proposed objectives?
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Not applicable.

3) Is the proposed work likely to be technically feasible?
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes.

4) Is the proposed project team qualified to efficiently and effectively implement the proposed project?
Provide detailed comments in support of your conclusion [Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Yes.

Miscellaneous comments
[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]

Overview:
This request will primarily fund a coordinator that will develop (over four years) a program to develop and implement a teacher training program to involve middle and high school teachers in a series of lectures and field studies/research with a focus on the San Joaquin River natural environment and issues. Sponsored by the San Joaquin River Parkway and Conservation Trust, the proposed project would be based in Fresno County and focus the development of 30 teacher "river masters".

The project has merit in that will train and sustain the involvement of the thirty teachers over the period of time designated in the grant request. Once the teachers are trained, they will involve their students in riparian ecosystem studies and research.

Positive aspects:
- training and follow-up of 30 teachers who will form a cadre of support for other teachers
- collaboration with many federal, state and local agencies involved with CAL-FED issues and projects
- continuation of CAL-FED support from FY 1999.

Negative aspects:
- lack of initial identification of curriculum to be used with teachers
- lack of connection of how the program is connected to school reform issues such as standards based education.
- lack of identification of how the program will be sustain beyond the duration of the grant.

Reviewer's comments: This program has merit and should be funded even if with only partial funding. The scope of the work is reasonable and will create a solid program for the sponsor.

Overall Evaluation Summary Rating	**Provide a brief explanation of your summary rating**
☐ Excellent X Very Good ☐ Good ☐ Fair ☐ Poor	[Note: in the electronic version, this will be an expandable field]